STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

SUPPORT TO ACADEMIC BASED RESEARCH ON LEADERSHIP VISION AND GENDER IMPLICATIONS

BY

COLONEL SALLY D. MURPHY
United States Army

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 3

19970624 113

AWC STRATEGY RESEARCH PROJECT

**Support to Academic Based Research
on Leadership Vision and Gender Implications**

by

Colonel Sally D. Murphy

Colonel Herbert F. Harback
Project Advisor

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

U. S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Sally D. Murphy (COL), USA

TITLE: Support to Academic Based Research on Leadership Vision and Gender Implications

FORMAT: Strategy Research Paper

DATE: 30 April 1997   PAGES: 44   CLASSIFICATION: Unclassified

The purpose of this paper is to describe U. S. Army War College (AWC) support to an academic based research project on leadership vision and to recommend expanded support to similar research by students, faculty and staff of the AWC. This paper explains AWC support to on-going research being conducted by Dr. Candida G. Brush, Boston University, and Dr. Barbara J. Bird, American University, under the auspices of the Human Resource Policy Institute of Boston University. The intent of the AWC effort is to ensure their research, analysis and resulting publications include a Military Group. The Brush and Bird study analyzes the leadership vision of successful women, examines the relationship of personal and organizational characteristics to vision, and compares these findings to previous studies. "Support to Academic Based Research on Leadership Vision and Gender Implications" suggests that additional scholarly research, including that which can be leveraged by the U. S. Army from academic institutional efforts, is necessary to achieve the vision of the "fourth" AWC and to support the U. S. Army in its re-engineering efforts.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PURPOSE

The purpose of this paper is to describe U. S. Army War College (AWC)

support to an academic based research project on leadership vision and to

recommend expanded support to similar research by students, faculty and staff

of the AWC. As a student in the AWC Class of 1997, my strategic research

project was to support research being conducted by Dr. Candida G. Brush,

Boston University, and Dr. Barbara J. Bird, American University, in order to

ensure their data included a military element for analysis. The Brush and Bird

research is gathering data to further analyze leadership vision of successful

women, examine the relationship of personal and organizational characteristics

to vision, and compare their findings to pervious studies. A focus of their effort is

to compare the leadership visions of men and women. While supporting their

data collection effort, I became convinced that similar research support is

important for the U. S. Army, the AWC and its members.

OPPORTUNITIES

The Changing U. S. Army. The U. S. Army and its component

institutions are downsizing and re-engineering as a result of external and internal

pressures. While the U. S. Army projects its future, the future is coming faster

than ever before. As many distinguished speakers have noted at the AWC this

year, the 21st century has already arrived for the Department of Defense.

Resolution of the Cold War, technological advancements and competing fiscal

pressures on the National Command Authority are external factors impacting the U. S. Army's core structures. The future's complexity, speed and ambiguity present challenges and drive internal changes to the U. S. Army, as well. There have been and will continue to be many internal changes to the U. S. Army in its re-engineering effort. These external and internal forces are causing the U. S. Army to assess the way it thinks and performs. [1]

As the U. S. Army re-evaluates the way it thinks and performs, the speed with which U. S. Army leaders at all echelons must process information, make decisions and communicate is increasing. This accelerated decision cycle is introduced at a time when flattened staffs force relatively unimpeded information directly to leadership for decision.[2] Leader decision making and communication are changing. Leader communication within an organization faced with dramatic change, complexity, speed and ambiguity remains vital to the organization and to the execution of its missions.

At a fiscal disadvantage and in difficult times, the U. S. Army requires vision and research to shape the ill-defined, complex nature of its future and communicate its decisions. All external and internal changes present opportunities for the U. S. Army. It has opportunities to discover more about itself and to design better ways to employ its resources. Among those opportunities is a challenge to better employ its personnel resources. As a people-based institution, the U. S. Army must leverage the maximum out of

every soldier in order to achieve the efficiency and effectiveness needed for today's and tomorrow's challenges. Marginalized segments of the U. S. Army work force can no longer be accepted.

One area of human resource management where leveraging maximum performance is needed is in U. S. Army leadership, especially concerning the contributions of its women leaders. During the last 25 years the U. S. Army has increased its number of women soldiers and made slow, awkward progress toward women's integration into various fields. As it is now presented with an opportunity to review and re-engineering itself, the U. S. Army should use emerging popular work and research to develop methods for maximizing the contribution of its women leaders. Such a foundation provides a basis to end marginalization of women leaders and facilitate the U. S. Army's movement toward a newer diversity management paradigm.[3] If one asks why, after 25 years of expanded roles and representation the U. S. Army is still grappling with full acceptance and a glass ceiling limiting women's contributions, it would be helpful to become expert in emerging thought and research.

The "Fourth" War College. As an example of U. S. Army re-assessment, the AWC is continuing development into its fourth evolution, the "Fourth" War College. This effort is an opportunity to exploit research while re-engineering an institution. The vision of the "Fourth" War College is to be "the nation's preeminent center for strategic leadership and landpower, a learning

3

institution, preparing today's leaders for tomorrow's challenges, and pursuing mastery of the strategic art through education, research, and outreach."[4] Naturally, the efforts of the AWC are on military preparedness to support varying ground warfare operations and increased effectiveness in a changing and volatile environment.[5] To do this and support the broader goals of the U. S. Army, the AWC should focus greater effort toward understanding human resource issues relevant to current and future U. S. Army challenges. The faculty and student body should focus more intently on the inevitable changes in U. S. Army demographics and how to better lead this diverse force. The AWC's vision identifies an opportunity for the college to continue expanding its curriculum toward more focused research on human resources, diversity, and, specifically, leadership of women.

As the U. S. Army's senior leadership institution, with its unique position relative to the Headquarters, Department of the U. S. Army and the Training and Doctrine Command, it is logical that the AWC not only advance its own research and studies concerning the U. S. Army's human resource dimension, but that it also lead an effort for appropriate work in other learning and research institutions. Drawing from a knowledge base gleaned from current work in human resource management, the AWC should design a focused plan to research critical issues necessary to best manage and leverage the U. S. Army's ever increasingly diverse work force. The AWC should initiative a re-focusing of the U. S. Army's academic and research centers to support human resource and

diversity efforts. At this point of historic change, the U. S. Army should turn attention toward serious research on the human element. It is the human element that is most vulnerable and critical to the U. S. Army's future.

WHY STUDY VISION?

"Few good things in human affairs 'just happen.' In the majority of cases, things happen only when people dream of a better tomorrow, decide they truly want to make it happen, and then act to turn their dreams into reality. That is what vision is all about."[6] "Vision is a sense of the future. It is an imagined possibility, stretching beyond today's capability, providing an intellectual bridge from today to tomorrow, and forming a basis for looking ahead, not for affirming the past or the status quo. The power of a vision is that it gives leaders a basis for positive action, growth, and transformation."[7] As these two statements suggest, civilian and military leaders value the importance of vision.

Vision is recognized as a significant part of leadership. Therefore, the study and understanding of vision and the consequences of its effect on an organization should be more completely understood. Leading scholars and consultants support vision as the key to leadership. They assert that the use of vision is one of the most distinguishable characteristics of leaders as they "inspire performance, loyalty and strong organizational cultures in their firms."[8]

Although emerging research contributes to a general understanding of vision and its effects, the study of gender as a variable in leader vision has just begun. This developing research supports a need for more comparative, academic research. The need is based on increasing numbers of women leaders, growing stereotyping and speculation regarding women in the workplace, and corporate experience that implies more similarity than difference in leadership by gender. "A systematic comparison of gender effects in leadership vision, organizational strategy and structure is needed to determine the existence and importance of similarities and differences, and, hopefully overturn unfounded speculations."[9]

WHY THIS STRATEGIC RESEARCH PROJECT?

The activity of my support to research facilitates a comparison of gender effects in leadership, organizational strategy, and structure. The paper provides an example of collaboration between the AWC and academic research. Though a small scale effort, it demonstrates a manner in which the college and other institutions can collaborate for benefit. This report describes AWC support to an on-going research effort that could have significant impact on the understanding of gender differences and similarities in leadership vision, organizational strategy, and structure. A study that could be of value to the U. S. Army as it manages increased diversity in senior leadership positions.

BACKGROUND ON CURRENT RESEARCH

The "Vision Group" Study. Dr. Cecilia Falbe, Dr. Mark Kriger, Dr. Paul Meising of State University of New York-Albany and Dr. Laurie Larwood, Dean, University of Nevada-Las Vegas used a short, mail questionnaire of Fortune 1000 executives, business school dean's and heads of non-profit organizations to research the growing interest in the concept of organizational vision.[10] The research focused on "vision content, or the elements of the visions...and the relationships between a vision's content and its organizational and individual context." It addressed insufficient research on the content of strategic visions by using a body of data suitable for multivariate analysis as opposed to prior research that used the case study approach.[11]

Research issues included the ability of executives to articulate a vision, patterns and clusters of vision evaluations and the relation of vision to organizational characteristics. The results of the "Vision Group" study suggested "a more complete understanding of the content of the visions of top executives, the existence of patterns of vision, and the relationship of those patterns to organizational and individual characteristics." Because of its size and design, the data also provides a basis for further empirical research.[12]

However, the study, like others in the field, focused nearly exclusively on male populations.[13] It has been suggested that less than 10% of all studies include or focus on women even though more women are entering the work

force and taking leadership positions. The dependence and expansion of women in the work force are expected to continue. As a result of the foundation laid by the "Visions Group" and growing interest in women's leadership, there continues to be a need for further research on leadership vision, to include gender differences and similarities.

The Human Resource Policy Institute of Boston University Study on Leadership Vision (Brush and Bird). Current research by Doctors Brush and Bird, under the auspices of the Human Resource Policy Institute of Boston University, began in 1994 when they decided to replicate a leadership visions dimensions study created by the "Vision Group." The "Vision Group" study prompted Brush and Bird to propose new research that focuses on the leadership vision of successful women entrepreneurs, "examines the relationship of personal and organizational characteristics to vision, and compares these findings to previous studies." Later, they proposed a systematic investigation of leadership vision in gender-matched samples. They suggest that their research will reveal the extent to which differences in vision are significant, and to what extent these differences may be related to organizational strategy and structure. Brush and Bird are researching the following:

1. What are the similarities and differences in dimensions of leadership vision based on gender?

2. Are there similarities and/or differences in the relationship of leadership vision to organizational strategy based on gender?

3. Are there similarities and/or differences in the relationship of leadership vision to organizational structure based on gender?

In their research, Brush and Bird use the "Vision Group" vision measures to survey women entrepreneurs and executives.[14] They also included a new set of questions that addressed organizational strategies, polices, personal satisfaction and style.[15]

Preliminary results demonstrate that the vision dimensions of successful women differ from those of successful men. Through factor analysis and comparison to previous studies, emerging results indicate that vision dimensions of women are similar to that of men. However, the importance of vision items varies. The Brush and Bird study has, thus far, identified women's leadership vision descriptors to be innovative, action oriented, integrative, and inspirational. This compares to the "Vision Group's" male-based research findings in which leadership vision was described as long term, planned, strategic and formal.[16] The Brush and Bird findings have, to this point, characterized women's vision as "innovative realism." That term includes flexibility, innovation, action orientation, integration, changing and inspirational descriptors. The previous studies by the "Vision Group" described men's vision as characteristically "strategy formulation," including planned, long term, formalized and strategic descriptors.[17]

9

Due to the small sample of Brush and Bird's initial work and the general lack of direct, comparative, statistical analysis, there was a limit to the generalizations that can be made at that point. [18] It is for that reason, Brush and Bird proposed expanded, systematic investigation of leadership vision in a gender-matched sample. Their investigation is to determine "the extent to which these differences in vision are significant, and might be related to organizational strategy and structure."[19]

In their proposal, the researchers suggested an expanded effort would increase the sample size. At that time (1996) they began the first comparative research that examines "gender in strategy formulation and vision results in speculations about similarities and differences between men and women." Their research analyzes gender leadership vision dimensions, its similarities and differences, and relationships of vision, organizational strategy and structure.[20] The data collection effort continues, but by the Summer of 1997, further emerging results should be available offering greater opportunity for analysis.

AWC SUPPORT THE BRUSH-BIRD STUDY AS PART OF ITS EFFORTS IN DIVERSITY.

In 1996, while Brush and Bird were expanding their research effort, a coincidental meeting with COL Herbert F. Harback of the Department of Command, Leadership and Management (DCLM), United States U. S. Army War College (AWC) revealed a shared interest in including a military executive group

in the systematic comparison of gender effects in leadership vision, organizational strategy and structure. In a limited sampling, the AWC Resident Class of 1996 had completed modified surveys resembling the original entrepreneurial survey. Response from the 1996 sample group resulted in 27 completed surveys, all but 3 of which were male respondents. [21]

Later that year I was asked to join in the AWC effort to support the Brush and Bird research. My research objective became support to the data collection effort and translation of military terminology and culture, where necessary. This project is also linked to the findings of the 1996 AWC Strategic Leadership Workshop on Women in the Military. During the workshop, Dr. Brush presented issues and opportunities for the future and discussed some of the emerging data from her Leadership Vision research. The workshop developed a number of critical issues in the development of senior women leaders and the issue of vision became one of the most important. The emergence of data that indicates gender influences one's visioning, style and outcome also suggests that the woman's style of "vision is one more conductive to a diverse work force and a diversity of mission requirements."[22] An immediate outcome of the workshop was that the AWC joined Boston University's visioning research. My project is in support of that joining.

Scope of Work. The first step in supporting the Brush and Bird research was to coordinate a scope of work that would be productive for all concerned.

We agreed that I would attempt to maximize the number of surveys from the current class, help with pairing responses by gender and like position, and translate military terminology and culture, when necessary. We considered my involvement in some statistical analysis, but lack of expertise led us to decide that it was best left to trained researchers. We also considered possibly conducting interviews with a few senior military executives. This would have been done in the form and style of the interviews Brush and Bird are doing with male and female executives and entrepreneurs. Time constraints and competing demands prevented interviews, however, it should remain open for consideration at a later date.

Acceptance of the Survey Vehicle. The survey instrument is viable and will provide relevant data to the study. However, in future efforts, the following observations should be considered.

The questionnaire was developed with a limited knowledge of U. S. Army culture and military terminology. I do not believe the instrument was fully vetted by a military representative, nor do I believe it was pre-tested. If the Class of 1996 sample group was intended as a pre-test, I can find no indication of feedback to the researchers. There were no changes made to the initial 1966 survey. I considered suggesting changes to the survey, but decided consistency in the survey instrument was more important. This accommodated standards within the sample, but also perpetuated the irregularities.

An initial review of the survey instrument identified some incongruities, not the least of which was the time reference of the questionnaire. The frame of reference addresses a person who is a currently serving commander. Nearly all of the respondents were students at the time they completed the surveys. This focus problem presented an initial opening for criticism of the survey and caused confusion as to what frame of reference the student should take in responding. It is my belief that several of the responses demonstrate a mixed frame of reference, answering some questions from the perspective of a previous leadership assignment and some, mainly the personal data, from the present perspective.

The early questions also infer that command is the only relevant leadership position. This, too, then framed the respondents' reference and generated numerous questions and non-responses from individuals who questioned the relevance of their input. The use of command as an exclusive reference for leadership too narrowly defines leaders. Many questions addressed to me personally and in marginal comments marked on the surveys indicated that many in the population did not consider themselves qualified in command-leadership experience to participate. Given the experience and maturity of the population selected for AWC education, I believe it was inference in the survey instrument that misled those so influenced.

The Survey Instrument and Qualitative Concerns. Technical qualitative concerns about the survey were identified with the assistance of Dr. Glenda Nogami, AWC. They include both administrative and substantive features.

- The identification of unit of assignment would have been better describe by branch, echelon and by identifying either a TOE or TDA organizational structure.[23] Additionally, location would have been better determined by region of the United States, for example, NW, NE, SE; and Europe, Asia, etc.

- In self definition, include a choice for students from sister services.

- The use of annual budget as a measurement tool could be irrelevant to the Military Group. Many of the senior officers in primary staff and management positions do not manage their own budgets although they wield extraordinary authority and leadership on strategic events. This should not be taken as irresponsibility by senior military leaders, but as an indication of differing organizational structure. This lack of focus on the fiscal aspect of an organization is perhaps a significant deviation from the civilian executive and entrepreneur population.

- In questions where selections include percentages, either all choices should be identified by percentage or none should use percentages.

- The extreme categories exemplified by "strongly agree and strongly disagree" should be aligned with the extreme numbers on the choice line. It appears visually as if there is a range of numbers that speak to the extreme positions, which is not accurate. This type of question should also include the choice "no opinion" as a center point. The "no opinion" data point should be in the center position as it connotes positive and neutral attributes.

- Written answers should allow sufficient space. This block became important in the difficult to pair surveys. I believe more lengthy responses would have provided information that would have facilitated gender-pairing in the most extreme populations.

- In some instances, a scale could have been more descriptive.

- In the self description section, greater range is necessary to accommodate the variety of people surveyed. In hindsight, blocks identifying retired and other service personnel would have been helpful.

- The U. S. Army no longer identifies rank by grade and discourages its use. This may seem trivial to civilians but it encourages a respect for rank as opposed to a pay scale. In future, it would be better to refer to rank.

- Recommend salary range choices be displayed vertically to demonstrate progression and facilitate the eye seeking the correct response.

- Race identification is always difficult. I believe different institutions stratify with differing terminology. To a military audience, Oriental and Asian should be identified as Asian/Pacific in keeping with U. S. Army normative terminology. Also, the survey appears prejudicial because it identifies several of the races as "American" while others are not. Consistency is essential.

The Military Group Sample. The AWC Resident Class of 1997 joined and the limited sample from the Resident Class of 1996 form the core base of the Military Group for Leadership Vision analysis. The entire U. S. uniformed membership of the Class of 1997 was provided a survey and a transmittal cover letter addressing the purpose of the project. The cover letter included a faculty and student endorsement in an effort to demonstrate the dual purpose of supporting the individual SRP and supporting the AWC commitment to the research. It was also suspected that participation would be greater if presented in such a manner. The surveys were handed out through DCLM faculty channels and were to be collected to ensure maximum participation. Due to the coincidental end of the term and some miscommunication, returns were received both through faculty channels and provided directly to me. The method of

collection was not a factor in data gathering as I am sure all available responses were collected from both sources.

The Challenge of Gender Parity in Data Collection. Upon return of the initial Resident Class of 1997 surveys, it became apparent that there was a research need for parity among the genders -- men and women -- for the purpose gender-based analysis. Due to the historically low percentages of uniformed women attendees at the AWC, parity with the larger male population is not possible. I did not initially understand that gender parity was critical to the analysis. If I had, I would have suggested randomly reducing the numbers of men sampled in order to achieve parity with the women surveyed. This, however, would have only resulted in 10-15 surveys from each gender would have provided insignificant data for analysis.

In an effort to expand the sample from women respondents, I selected to approach women who had previously, but recently, experienced the strategic and visioning processes as presented by the AWC. I attempted to locate a data base that included all graduates from 1990 to the present. I wanted a data base that could sort by gender and include current addresses. To my knowledge, there is no data base that provides such information. The best source I could find was the AWC Alumni Office.

Of course, the Alumni Office maintains a data base that only includes members of the alumni association and not all graduates. The data base is

17

dependent upon the alumnus to update an address and, therefore, is in varying degrees of currency. Also, active, reserve or retired status is not reliably or consistently identified.

The Alumni Office provided a mail listing of 1990 through 1996 AWC alumni. I screened for female graduates without reference to gender data. I subjectively identified gender through traditional male and female name association. Some surveys were inadvertently sent to men, who informed me of my error. Conversely, it is possible that I missed some women whose names I did not correctly assess. There is no indication of gender cross-over or intentional misinformation as a result of this technique. I believe all the responses forwarded for research were responses from women graduates.

Mailing to the expanded population included a second cover letter that attempted to solicit support and explain why we were reaching out for more women respondents. The cover letter also tried to address the perceived problem of frame of reference and bias toward the position of command to a point that would encourage response, but not direct their responses.

When it was apparent that I was not going to get the quantity of responses needed for gender parity, I made a subsequent appeal to the U. S. uniformed women in the Class of 1997 for support. Several responded to this plea and they were added to the data collection.

General Description of the Military Group. The Military Group supporting the Leadership Vision study is limited to graduates and current students of the AWC. The majority of the responses came from resident attendees. The predominate class surveyed was the Class of 1997. The expanded survey group from alumnae of the Classes of 1990 to 1996 was limited to women and produced the largest number of women respondents. It also introduced data from non-resident graduates and recently retired personnel. Responses from the Classes of 1996 and 1997 were only resident course attendees. Samples included representatives from the Reserve Components (U. S. Army Reserve and National Guard) and to a lesser extent, members of the Sister Services.

Until future classes are surveyed or a more complete graduate data base is identified, I believe the data collection on this research effort has exhausted all avenues to survey AWC contemporary (1990 to present) graduates.

In summary, the survey data collected as of 1 April 1997 included 154 responses from men in the Resident Classes of 1996 and 1997 and 38 responses from women in the Classes of 1990 to present. This effort and the data range underscore the limited number of uniformed women who have attended the AWC. The overall response rate for the Resident Class of 1997 was 54.6%. The response rate for the Class of 1996 is unknown. The response

rate from the alumnae group is not yet determined as responses are still being received.

On Administration. The administration of a survey of this size is labor intensive. Tracking status and responses requires vigilance. Determination of which data elements to tracked in the processes of dissemination and response is necessary to maintain proper accounting. Also, to avoid personal expense, I should have coordinated administrative support to fund the mailings. However, delays in identifying ways to expand the population of women respondents prompted me not to delay further with administrative coordination. As stated before and in hindsight, an alternative approach of sizing the group to the population of women should have been formally considered if pairing were the primary focus of research.

Processing Data. In an effort to facilitate processing, surveys were returned in phases. First, initial responses from the Class of 1997 were provided in bulk. Second, initial responses from the expanded alumnae population and the last few surveys from the women of the Class of 1997 were provided in groups as they were returned. Finally, all others will be provided upon receipt. Processing of Military Group data is being under the supervision of Dr. Bird at American University. Dr. Bird is responsible for the quantitative and qualitative analysis of the Military Group in the Leadership Vision study.

Status of Analysis of Military Group. Analytical conclusions on the Military Group sample will not be available until the data processing effort is completed. Emerging results may be available in the Summer or Fall of 1997.

Gender-Pairing. The second step in assisting data collection for this research effort was gender pairing survey results to comparable roles. Many of the survey's were paired easily because comparable combat support, combat service support, acquisition, and teaching positions were represented by both genders. However, the overwhelming numbers of Infantry, Armor, Special Forces, Field Artillery and Aviation male respondents precluded literal pairing with women responses. Similarly, the numbers of female nurse and other medical specialty respondents were difficult to pair with male counterparts. In some cases we paired nurses with teachers, recruiters and logistical support personnel based on their elaborated description of duties. I am unaware of any effort to pair cross-service. Additionally, there was no effort to differentiate between active and reserve component or active and recently retired persons.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On AWC Support to Brush and Bird Research. Overall, the process of providing support to the academic research effort was clearly focused and executable. Collaboration with both Dr. Brush and Dr. Bird worked well. This was remarkable, in my judgment, due to the near exclusive reliance on coordination by electronic mail. Once gender-pairing was necessary, I traveled

to assist Dr. Bird. This hands-on support is necessary due to the researchers' unfamiliarity with military culture and terminology.

The collaboration pointed out great differences in our cultures. Where I am not qualified in research techniques, terminology and processes and am not expert in any field of human resources, the researchers have no understanding of the military. I believe the potential for misunderstanding or misinterpreting the Military Group data is high if a military representative does not assist to the conclusion of their effort. In future research efforts, it would be best if appropriate military expertise was used in design of the survey instrument, data collection, and analysis of the data. In this type of research and collaboration, the U. S. Army involvement should encompass the project from definition of scope to conclusion in order to maximize the benefit of the effort.

On Survey Instrument and Culture. To avoid introducing significant variance, the military surveys were not substantially changed in 1997, although they could have benefited from an effort to talk more plainly to the military culture. In my opinion, the lack of such clarification resulted in a lack of participation by some and criticism of the survey vehicle that I was not able to totally overcome with accompanying cover letters. The effects of the survey vehicle will potentially introduce some minor misleading data.

I suggest that there may have been an unintentional variance in the method of selecting the civilian and military groups. The initial Leadership Vision

research proposal focused on civilian executives and entrepreneurs. This population will possibly produce more complete and easily understandable data than will the follow-on Military Group due to their familiarity to business frames of reference. The military culture provides a substantially different response rate due in part to the expectation that one will respond to a request, tasking, or assignment. Although all civilian and military respondents are volunteers, I suggest the obligation to complete the survey may be greater in the military group. If true, this is both positive, in that the rate of return was higher, and negative, in that some of the responses were not really provided in a genuinely cooperative and enthusiastic manner.

The initial executive and entrepreneurial response rate was 26% and the Military Group's is nearly 55%, however, there are quality factors to consider. The willing, supportive, and, perhaps, enthusiastic participants from the civilian population compare to a willing, but not necessarily interested, supportive or enthusiastic military population. I suggest that those civilians not interested in the project may refrain from responding at a greater rate than the military population. Thus, lukewarm attitudes will not be reflected in analysis.[24] In the Military Group there will be an element representing lukewarm support.

Some of these reluctant respondents may not be useful to the research. I base my assertion on a cursory review of some of the surveys. Some displayed the individual's name in the name of unit block, some included exasperated

answers to questions clearly not framed in the military context and some had marginal notes that expressed concern. Although I believe the majority of the Military surveys were completed sufficiently and with forethought, I regret that these less-than-thoughtful responses may communicate a less-than-professional attitude from the Military Group to the civilian researchers and potentially through them and their publications to the community at large.

CONCLUSION

In the search for a meaningful SRP topic, I approached COL Harback, who suggested that I consider continuing AWC support to the Brush and Bird research on Leadership Vision. This led to participation in a very interesting, scholarly, research project. Although it is disappointing that the results of the survey will not be known until after graduation, I would recommend such projects to others. Although an unusual approach to my required SRP, or at least a project that I would have never considered left to my own imagination, this effort has been an adventure and has introduced me to a new arena.

It is very important to the Leadership Vision project and the Military Group's representation in resulting analysis and publication of findings that an AWC representative continue to support the Brush and Bird project. I recommend continued support of this research effort from the AWC Class of 1998. I encourage someone to continue support at this point, the conclusion of the data gathering phase, and continue into the analysis and conclusion phases.

I also suggest AWC research include similar efforts concerning other minority groups.

The notion of patterns and clusters of vision and the relation of vision to organizational characteristics as discussed in the "Vision Group's" findings call for further military research.[25] I suspect that much of the identity by military sub-culture, branch, unit of assignment and the like could be linked by expression of vision. Where the U. S. Army has occasional internal conflict or lack of understanding, such as in, echelon perspectives, tactical versus strategic points of view, combat versus supporting arms standpoint, special forces versus all other viewpoints; research in the areas of vision, articulation of vision, and leadership is warranted.

In its continuing evolution into the "Fourth" War College, I suggest the AWC focus on research as a method to facilitate the U. S. Army with future challenges. To delay looking at human resource issues is usually to wait until they become a crisis. My suggestion for research into leadership and management issues in a diverse U. S. Army is a call for expanded research on human factors and diversity beyond gender and race.

The U. S. Army demonstrates its reliance on vision in various doctrinal and strategic publications. It relies upon combatant leaders to "see the battlefield." It challenges force developers to anticipate change in

modernization. One could argue that without a vision of where the U. S. Army wants to go with its diverse work force, it is improbable that it will get there.

"Failure to see the future can be attributed to many causes, but it always begins with a lack of vision."[26]

APPENDIX A

Biographies on Doctors Brush and Bird

Candida G. Brush

Candida G. Brush is an Assistant Professor of management Policy at Boston University. Dr. Brush received her D. B. A. from Boston University where she was a recipient of the R. D. Irwin Foundation Doctoral Dissertation Fellowship for 1992. She holds a B. A. from the University of Colorado, and an M. B. A. from Boston College. Dr. Brush has worked as a consultant to entrepreneurs, co-owner of a land sales and development company, and a division manager of a regional commercial airline. She has taught management courses for the past 13 years at Boston University and Boston College. Dr. Brush is author of International Entrepreneurship: The Effect of Firm Age on Motive for Internationalization (Garland Publishing, 1995) and the co-author of The Woman Entrepreneur: Starting, Financing and Managing a Successful New Business (Lexington Books, 1986). She has published in the Journal of Business Venturing, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, Journal of Small Business Management and Frontiers of Entrepreneurship Research. She was a participant and presenter in the U. S. Army War College Strategic Leadership Workshop on Women in the Military and is a recent appointee to the Defense Advisory Council on Women in the Service (DACOWITS).

Barbara J. Bird

Barbara J. Bird is an Associate Professor of Management at the American University. Dr. Bird received her Ph. D. At the University of Southern California and has had prior appointments at UCLA and Case Western Reserve University. She is the author of <u>Entrepreneurial Behavior</u> and numerous articles on the behavioral aspects of entrepreneurship. Dr. Bird has published in <u>Academy of Management Review, Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</u>. Her current research focuses on issues of Time in the new venture and creative process, the drama of new venture creation, satisfaction of self-employment, and entrepreneurial competencies; one industry focus is software. She served as program chair and division chair and is a current member of the task force on internationalization for the entrepreneurship division of the Academy of Management. She serves on the editorial review board of <u>Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice</u> and regularly review for <u>Organizational Science</u>, the national Institute of Science and Technology, and various academic meetings.

APPENDIX B

The Military Group Survey

LEADERSHIP VISION

Your responses to this questionnaire will remain completely confidential and you will remain completely anonymous. We thank you for taking the time to help us in our research by responding to our questionnaire.

The following questions pertain to the MILITARY UNIT (company, division, brigade or battalion) you lead.

1. What is the NAME and LOCATION of the MILITARY UNIT you lead?

   _____ name _____ location

2. How many PEOPLE are under your COMMAND? _____ people

3. Are the PEOPLE under your command (please indicate the percent that applies):

   ___ active army   ___ reserves   ___ national guard   ___ civilians

4. What are the PRIMARY ACTIVITIES carried out by your military unit?

   _____

5. What is the approximate SIZE of the ANNUAL BUDGET allocated to your military unit?

   $_____

6. How are the ROLES and RESPONSIBILITIES of the people in your military unit ORGANIZED? (i.e. by task, activity, mission, expertise, rank, etc.)

   _____

7. Has your military unit recently (within the past 12 months) undergone (please check one:)

   ___ major cuts in personnel
   ___ minor cuts in personnel
   ___ no significant cuts or personnel changes
   ___ minor expansion in personnel
   ___ major expansion in personnel

   If EXPANSION or CUTS have occurred, please estimate the PERCENTAGE CHANGE?

   ___ % decrease   ___ % increase

8. How many LEVELS are between the TOP LEADER and the LOWEST LEVEL in your military unit?

   ___ levels

9. How many people REPORT DIRECTLY to you?   ___ people

10. How many people comprise TOP LEADERSHIP TEAM in your military unit (grade 04 - Major) and above?

___ total people   ___ women   ___ minorities

11. What is the method of DECISION-MAKING used by top leaders in your military unit:

a. entrepreneurial- where on individual makes decisions based on personal judgement
b. professional- where specialists make decisions based on expertise and analytical tools.

Please check one:
___ always entrepreneurial
___ frequently entrepreneurial
___ 50% entrepreneurial and 50% professional
___ frequently professional
___ always professional

12. Please indicate your AGREEMENT OR DISAGREEMENT with the following statements as they apply to the military unit you lead:

	strongly disagree			*strongly agree*	
a. formal policies and procedures guide most decisions	1	2	3	4	5
b. important communications between department are documented by memo	1	2	3	4	5
c. formal job descriptions are maintained for each position	1	2	3	4	5
d. the top leadership team is comprised of specialists from particular areas (finance, personnel)	1	2	3	4	5
e. reporting relationships are formally defined	1	2	3	4	5
f. lines of authority are specified in a formal organization chart	1	2	3	4	5
g. rewards and incentives are administered by objective and systematic criteria	1	2	3	4	5
h. large budget changes are planned well in advance	1	2	3	4	5
i. plans tend to be formal and written	1	2	3	4	5
j. formal operating budgets guide day to day decisions	1	2	3	4	5

The following questions pertain to your LEADERSHIP PRACTICES/STYLE:

13. In a typical day, how do you spend your WORK TIME? (please assign a percentage- the total should add to 100%)

___ personnel issues
___ day to day operations
___ problem solving
___ budgeting/short term planning
___ strategic decision-making/ planning
___ group or team work
___ external relations
___ meetings other than above
___ other (please specify)_____
100% TOTAL

14. Please indicate the extent to which these statements describe your LEADERSHIP APPROACH (style):

	not at all true				_very true_
I favor securing an advantage for my unit rather than developing reciprocity with other units	1	2	3	4	5
I make decisions analytically (following logical reasoning) rather than intuitively (gut feelings)	1	2	3	4	5
I favor taking care of existing resources (human, financial) rather than securing additional resources	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer to play a good game than to win my point	1	2	3	4	5
I prefer communication to be formal rather than informal	1	2	3	4	5
I focus more on task completion than building strong relationships	1	2	3	4	5

15. Please rate yourself on the following MANAGEMENT SKILLS:

	no opinion	_poor_	_fair_	_good_	_very good_	_excellent_
Finance- securing funds, forecasting, budgeting	0	1	2	3	4	5
Dealing with people- management, human resource development	0	1	2	3	4	5
Public relations- media relations, communications, image development						
Idea generation- innovation	0	1	2	3	4	5
Operations- inventory management, production, day to day activities, logistics	0	1	2	3	4	5
Organizing and planning- strategy, organizational design, policy development	0	1	2	3	4	5

16. What do you consider to be your MAJOR LEADERSHIP STRENGTH/COMPETENCE?

_____

17. Please characterize the means by which you IMPLEMENT STRATEGIC (LONG RANGE) PLANS for your military unit: (check all that apply)

___ write policy memos to subordinates
___ use and post charts/graphs to measure progress toward goals
___ develop incentive systems
___ changes physical lay-out/facilities
___ use of symbols, logos
___ other (please specify_____

___ write policy memos to superiors
___ informal meetings
___ formal meetings
___ mentoring and coaching
___ changes in personnel
___ creation of new phrases or words

The following questions pertain to YOUR PERSONAL VISION of the military unit you lead.

18. Please describe your PERSONAL VISION for the military unit you lead:

_____
_____
_____
_____

19. To what extent does your PERSONAL VISION for your military unit AGREE with each of the following terms: (please respond to each line by circling the appropriate response)

	Very Little			Very Much	
planned	1	2	3	4	5
long term	1	2	3	4	5
formalized	1	2	3	4	5
product of leadership	1	2	3	4	5
strategic	1	2	3	4	5
widely accepted	1	2	3	4	5
well communicated	1	2	3	4	5
understood	1	2	3	4	5
flexible	1	2	3	4	5
innovative	1	2	3	4	5
purposeful	1	2	3	4	5
responsive to competition	1	2	3	4	5
action oriented	1	2	3	4	5
directs effort	1	2	3	4	5
integrated with visions of others	1	2	3	4	5
tactical	1	2	3	4	5
inspirational	1	2	3	4	5
changing	1	2	3	4	5
general	1	2	3	4	5
difficult to describe	1	2	3	4	5
detailed	1	2	3	4	5
risky	1	2	3	4	5
conservative	1	2	3	4	5
bottom line oriented	1	2	3	4	5
describes what is taking place	1	2	3	4	5
focused	1	2	3	4	5

20. How FAR INTO THE FUTURE does your CURRENT VISION of your military unit extend?_____ years

21. How LONG HAVE YOU HELD this vision? _____

22. Please check the INDICATORS that you use to determine the SUCCESSFUL INTEGRATION of your vision within your military unit. (Please check the response that most reflects your current practices)

Use as an indicator	Do not use as indicator	
—	—	officers use our vision vocabulary in communicating with others
—	—	non-officers use our vision vocabulary in communicating with others
—	—	people outside our military unit use our vision vocabulary in communicating with us

The following questions pertain to YOU AS AN INDIVIDUAL.

23. Please indicate your CURRENT STATUS:

a. ___ active army   ___ reserve   ___ national guard

b. What is your GRADE NUMBER   ____

c. What is your TITLE?   _____

24. How long have you worked in your PRESENT ASSIGNMENT? ____ months ____ years

25. What is your highest level of EDUCATION?

___ some high school   ___ some college   ___ graduate degree
___ high school graduate   ___ four year college degree

26. What is your AGE and GENDER?
____ years
____ male   ____ female

27. Do you have DEPENDENTS (a child or elder family member) LIVING WITH YOU? ___ Yes ___ No

28. What is your base SALARY RANGE?

___ < $20,000   ___ $36,000-$50,000   ___ $76,000-$100,000
___ $21,000-$35,000   ___ $51,000-$75,000   ___ > $100,000

29. What is your RACE?

___ African American   ___ Native American   ___ Asian (i.e. Indian)   ___ Middle Eastern
___ Caucasian   ___ Hispanic   ___ Oriental   ___ Other _____

30. Please briefly describe what you do regularly for PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT? (for example, meditation, yoga, writing in a journal, reading spiritual or self help books, marital arts, etc.)

_____

_____

31. Please answer the following regarding your MILITARY CAREER:
    a. year joined the military?   _____
    b. main reason you joined?   _____
    c. occupation/activities prior to joining?   _____
    d. number of years international service?   _____ years
    e. number of foreign countries served in?   _____ countries
    f. number of months hazardous duty service?   _____ months

32. Please indicate your degree of agreement/disagreement with the following:

	strongly disagree			*strongly agree*	
I am satisfied with how I do my job	1	2	3	4	5
I am satisfied with the income I earn	1	2	3	4	5
I am satisfied with the people who work for/with me	1	2	3	4	5
I am satisfied with the future prospects of the military	1	2	3	4	5

33. Since you became a top military leader, what is the biggest LEADERSHIP CHALLENGE you have faced? How did you overcome this?

_____
_____
_____

34. As you look into the year 2010, what KEY THINGS do you think the MILITARY needs to do to PREPARE and DEVELOP officers to LEAD EFFECTIVELY and STRATEGICALLY?

_____
_____
_____

Please sketch or draw a PICTURE of your PERSONAL VISION of your military unit on the reverse side of this page.

If you would like to add any comments or suggestions, please feel free to do so.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT. YOUR RESPONSES WILL REMAIN COMPLETELY CONFIDENTIAL AND YOU WILL REMAIN COMPLETELY ANONYMOUS.

APPENDIX C

Explanatory Correspondence Forwarded with the Surveys

First enclosure is original cover letter and was included with all surveys distributed in the 1997 SRP effort.

Second enclosure is a cover letter added to the first in an effort to explain the project to the alumni Military Group and to further explain that the frame of reference the individual selects need not be that of a commander and is the individual's choice.

6 January 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR U. S. UNIFORMED COLLEAGUES

SUBJECT: USAWC Support to Academic Based Research--Leadership Vision

1. Attached is a short questionnaire regarding Leadership Vision. The USAWC is assisting research by Boston University that examines the characteristics and ways in which leaders use vision in leading organizations. This cooperation is the first USAWC effort to use a student Strategic Research Paper (SRP) in such collaboration. Your support is essential to the effort.

2. As you know, vision is used to inspire and motivate others in an organization. While the term "vision" is widely used, there is comparatively little research that studies what the dimensions are, and how it is used to achieve more effective organizational performance. Further, differences in the dimensions and use of vision across types of organizations are not well understood. The Boston University research includes investigations of successful entrepreneurs, corporate executives, heads of non-profit organization and business school deans and is designed to compare and contrast aspects of vision across many groups. It is highly desirable to include a United States Military Group in the Boston University study now in progress.

3. The questionnaire attached will take about 15 minutes to complete. All responses will remain completely confidential and you will remain completely anonymous. The survey, having a broader focus than Military, includes some phrasing and questions not adapted to our cultural organization or lingo. Please answer all questions as completely as possible and interpret a military simile where necessary.

4. If you participated in this survey with last year's class and are now a member of the staff or faculty, please disregard the request. All concerned appreciate your help in the project.

5. Faculty Instructors will distribute and collect the survey to facilitate maximum support of the effort. Questions concerning this effort should be directed to COL Sally Murphy, Seminar 13, Box 212, email is murphys.

Encl   HERBERT F. HARBACK   SALLY D. MURPHY
                        Colonel, Corps of Engineers   Colonel, Aviation
                        Chairman, Department of Command,   Student, USAWCClass of 1997
                         Leadership and Management

Distribution:

S

4 February 1997

MEMORANDUM FOR U. S. UNIFORMED WOMEN GRADUATES OF THE ARMY WAR COLLEGE

SUBJECT: Request for Support to Ongoing Army War College Research Effort

1. Attached is a questionnaire on Leadership Vision given to the Army War college (AWC) for use in an academic research effort. The original cover letter, next under, includes more details.

2. As the resident class' targeted population completed the survey, the researchers asked that we attempt to provide gender parity, which is, of course, infeasible with the current resident class. In an effort to increase the population of surveyed women, I selected women graduates from the classes of 1990-1996. The supplementing sample includes uniformed graduates from the Reserve and Active Components, as well as, Resident and Corresponding Studies classes, and all appropriate Services. You have been selected as a member of this supplementing population.

3. For consistency in the study, the survey remains unchanged since its initial use in a test sample with the class of '96. You will note some administrative errors, "civilian" terminology, and that the survey can take more than the 15 minutes suggested. If you are not currently serving in a traditionally defined leadership position, such as command, request you respond based on your current leadership position (staff, administration, etc.) or relate responses to your last command position. Your frame of reference is entirely your choice. Sister Service women need to identify their Service in question 3.

4. In order to provide substantial data collection representing women, I ask that you respond to my request for assistance as soon as your competing demands allow. If you participated in the limited effort of the Class of '96 or in a civilian capacity, please disregard this request.

5. The AWC Alumni office has been most helpful in providing access to you through their current data on alumni. On their behalf, I ask that you update your data concerning rank, duty status, address, etc. If you prefer, include a note with your returned survey and I will forward to the alumni office. The office address is: US Army War College, Alumni Association, 122 Forbes Ave., Carlisle, PA 17013-5247.

6. I appreciate your support and am hopeful that this effort will support ongoing human resource research relative to both the civilian and military cultures. With continued successful data collection (significant return of surveys) the AWC should be able to complete data collection and assist in analysis and conclusions.

Encl   SALLY D. MURPHY
                                            Colonel, Aviation
                                            Student, USAWC CLASS OF 1997

ENDNOTES

[1] Herbert F. Harback, "Critical Issue Paper: the Leadership Development of Senior Military Women for the 21st Century U. S. Army," 1 May 96, *Strategic Leadership Workshop on Women in the Military Proceedings*, U. S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, March 1996, H-5 - H9.

[2] Ibid.

[3] David A Thomas and Robin J. Ely, "Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity," *Harvard Business Review, September 1994, unnumbered photocopy.*

[4] *Curriculum Pamphlet, Academic Year 1997*, U. S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, ii.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Burt Nanus, "Leading the Vision Team," *Futurist*, Vol. 30, Issue 3, May 1996, 21.

[7] Gordon R. Sullivan and Michael V. Harper, Hope is not a Method: What Business Leaders Can Learn From America's U. S. Army, New York, Random House, 1996, 79.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Ibid., 3-4.

[10] Candida Brush to Sally Murphy, "Leadership Vision Project," November 22, 1996.

[11] Laurie Larwood, Cecilia M. Falbe, Mark P. Kriger and Paul Miesing, "Structure and Meaning of Organizational Vision," *Academy of Management Journal*, 1995, Vol. 38, No. 3, 740-769.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Ninety-five percent of the survey respondents were men

[14] Refer to page 4 of the survey.

[15] Candida G. Brush and Barbara Bird, "Research Proposal, Leadership Vision: A Comparative Study of Successful Male and Female Executives and Entrepreneurs," April 30, 1996, 5 - 6.

[16] Candida G. Brush and Barbara J. Bird, "Leadership Vision of Successful Women Entrepreneurs: Dimensions and Characteristics," Working Paper Series, Boston University School of Management Working Paper #96-14, February 22, 1996, unnumbered.

[17] Brush and Bird, "Research Proposal," 6.

[18] The first sample included only 60 successful women entrepreneurs.

[19] Brush and Bird, "Research Proposal."

[20] Ibid.,1.

[21] Candida G. Brush, November 22, 1996 letter, subject: Leadership Vision Project.

[22] Harback, H-20.

[23] TOE is an abbreviation for Table of Equipment. TDA is an abbreviation for Table of Distribution and Allowances. They refer to the manner in which the

U. S. Army is organized and equipped. The phrase "a TOE unit" refers to a tactical unit and the term "a TDA unit" refers to a non-tactical or supporting, administrative unit.

[24]Discussion between Dr. Brush and Sally Murphy, April 12, 1997, revealed some difficulty in getting male executives and entrepreneurs to respond to the survey.

[25]Larwood, 743-744.

[26]Sullivan and Harper, 94.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bartlett, Christopher A. and Sumantra Ghoshal. "Changing the Role of Top Management: Beyond Strategy to Purpose," *Harvard Business Review*, November-December 1994.

Brush, Candida G. and Barbara Bird. "Research Proposal, Leadership Vision: A Comparative Study of Successful Male and Female Executives and Entrepreneurs," April 30, 1996.

Brush, Candida G. and Barbara J. Bird. "Leadership Vision of Successful Women Entrepreneurs: Dimensions and Characteristics," Working Paper Series, Boston University School of Management Working Paper #96-14, February 22, 1996.

Brush, Candida G. November 22, 1996 letter to Sally Murphy, subject: Leadership Vision Project.

Harback, Herbert F. "Critical Issue Paper: the Leadership Development of Senior Military Women for the 21st Century U. S. Army," 1 May 96, *Strategic Leadership Workshop on Women in the Military Proceedings*, U. S. Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, PA, March 1996.

Holm, Jeanne. Women in the Military: An Unfinished Revolution, Novato, CA: Presidio Press, 1982.

Jamison, Kathleen Hall. Beyond the Double Bind: Women and Leadership, NY: Oxford University Press, 1995.

Larwood, Laurie, Cecilia M. Falbe, Mark P. Kriger and Paul Miesing. "Structure and Meaning of Organizational Vision," *Academy of Management Journal*, 1995, Vol. 38, No. 3.

Nanus, Burt. "Leading the Vision Team," *Futurist*, Vol. 30, Issue 3, May 1996,

Ricks, Thomas E. "The Great Society in Camouflage," *The Atlantic Monthly*, December 1996

Rosener, Judy B. "Ways Women Lead," *Harvard Business Review*, November-December 1990.

Sullivan, Gordon R. and Michael V. Harper. Hope is Not a Method: What Business Leaders Can Learn From America's U. S. Army, New York, Random House, 1996.

Thomas, David A. and Robin J. Ely, "Making Differences Matter: A New Paradigm for Managing Diversity," *Harvard Business Review,* September 1994.

Thomas, R. Roosevelt, Jr. <u>Beyond Race and Gender; Understanding the Power of Your Total Work Force by Managing Diversity</u>, NY: AMACOM, 1991.

U. S. Army War College, *Curriculum Pamphlet, Academic Year 1997*, Carlisle Barracks, PA

U. S. Army War College. "Strategic Leadership and the 'Fourth' Army War College," *Joint Force Quarterly,* Summer 1996, Number 12.

U. S. Army War College. *Strategic Leadership Workshop on Women in the Military; Proceedings*, Carlisle Barracks, PA: March 1996.

Brush, Candida. "Women Strategic Leadership: Issues and Opportunities for the Future," March 11, 1996, speaking notes.

Harback, Herbert F. "Critical Issue Paper: The Leadership Development of Senior Military Women for the 21st Century," May 1, 1996.

Terry, Jo Carol. "Leadership Development of Senior Military Women in the Army," May 17, 1996.